

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated July 9, 2008, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-10, 13-17, 19-21, 23-50, 52-76, 78-79, and 81-82 are pending in this Application. Claims 1-10, 30-39, and 59-73 are currently withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, independent claims 13, 20, 24, 28, 40, 42, 49, 53, and 57 have been amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 13-17, 19, 40-48, and 74-75 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Kuno (U.S. Patent No. 5,467,102) in view of Failla (U.S. Patent No. 5,128,662); rejects claims 20-21, 23, 25-29, 49-50, 52, 54-58, and 76-82 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas (U.S. Patent No. 5,499,330) in view of Robertson (U.S. Patent No. 6,486,895); and rejects claims 24 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas in view of Cassorla and further in view of Technology Update, Wordperfect Corporation Introduces Wordperfect 6.0 for DOS ([http://www.nfbnet.org/files/word\\_processing/WP60.TXT](http://www.nfbnet.org/files/word_processing/WP60.TXT); hereinafter "Wordperfect"). It is noted that claims 13, 20, 24, 28, 40, 42, 49, 53, and 57 have been amended. To the extent that these rejections remain applicable to the claims, as amended, the Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, as follows.

**A. Claims 13, 40, and 42**

Regarding the rejection of claims 13, 40, and 42, the Applicant respectfully submits that Kuno and Failla, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for displaying at least one selected page of an electronic book

displayed on a viewer having at least the combination of a plurality of hardware screens, wherein formatting the selected page for display on the screens of the viewer, wherein a plurality of format processes are used based on the number of the hardware screens and the number of pages requested by the subscriber, as recited in amended claim 13.

Further, none of the cited art teaches or suggests at least the combination of features: "if a number of the selected pages is equal to the number of hardware screens, each selected page is displayed on a different one of the hardware screens," "if the number of the selected pages is less than the number of hardware screens, the selected pages are enlarged and each of the hardware screens displays a different portion of the enlarged selected pages," and "if the number of the selected pages is greater than the number of hardware screens, the selected pages are reduced and are distributed across the plurality of hardware screens," as recited in amended claim 40, and similarly recited in amended claim 42.

Failla discloses how to connect more than one display segments together. There is no disclosure in Failla how a document is displayed on the plurality of segments. Kuno discloses the sequences of pages to be displayed on screens A and B, as shown in Figs. 7A-8C. However, Kuno fails to teach or suggest a plurality of format processes being used based on the number of the hardware screens and the number of pages requested by the subscriber, as recited in amended claim 13, and the features of amended claims 40 and 42, as described above.

For at least the combination of the above reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 13, 40, and 42, as amended, are allowable over the cited references. As claims 13, 40, and 42 are allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 14-19, 41, 43-48, and 74-75, which depend from claims 13, 40, and 42, respectively, are likewise allowable over the cited references.

**B. Claims 20, 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57**

Regarding the rejection of claims 20, 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57, the Applicant respectfully submits that Lucas, Robertson, and Wordperfect, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for simultaneously displaying on a viewer a selected portion of an electronic book and content from a plurality of separate information sources, comprising receiving a request from a subscriber for displaying at least a portion of the electronic book and, afterward, receiving requests, along with an identification of the plurality of separate information sources, for simultaneously displaying the content from the plurality of separate information sources, as recited in amended claim 20 and similarly recited in amended claims 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57.

Lucas discloses a document display system for organizing and displaying documents as screen objects organized along strand paths. Robertson discloses a display system for displaying lists of linked pages, which are downloaded from the World Wide Web and are displayed in a book metaphor termed a WebBook. (See Abstract.) Such lists of linked pages, however, are not generated by receiving a request from a subscriber for displaying at least a portion of the electronic book and, afterward, receiving requests, along with an identification of the plurality of separate information sources, as recited in amended claims 20, and similarly in claims 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57. Therefore, none of Lucas and Robertson, alone or in combination, discloses at least the combination of features recited in Claims 20, 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57, as amended.

Wordperfect and Cassorla fail to make up for the deficiencies of Lucas and Robertson.

For at least the above combination of reasons, the Applicant submits that Claims 20, 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57, as amended, are allowable over the cited

references. As claims 20, 24, 28, 49, 53, and 57 are allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 21, 23, 25-27, 29, 50, 52, 54-56, 58, 76, 78-79, and 81-82, which depend from claims 20, 28, 49, and 57, respectively, are likewise allowable over the cited references.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 13-17, 19-21, 23-29, 40-50, 52-58, 74-76, 78-79, and 81-82 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 026880-00020.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Wan-Ching Montfort  
Registration Number 56,127

Customer Number 004372  
ARENT FOX LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: 202-857-6000  
Fax: 202-638-4810

WC/CYM